

1  
2  
3  
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
5 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

6 \* \* \*

7 PATRICIA FITZPATRICK, et al.,

Case No. 2:17-cv-01886-JAD-PAL

8 Plaintiffs,

ORDER

9 v.

10 LAS VEGAS METROPOLITAN POLICE  
DEPARTMENT, et al.,

11 Defendants.

12 The court conducted a hearing on July 26, 2018 on the parties' Motion to Amend Complaint  
13 (ECF No. 66), and Stipulation to Extend Time (ECF No. 67). Nadine Morton and A.J. Sharp  
14 appeared on behalf of plaintiffs. Robert Freeman and Stephen Vogel appeared on behalf of  
15 defendants.

16 Plaintiffs seek to amend the complaint for a fourth time in order to eliminate potential  
17 semantics-based arguments so that any pretrial proceedings, as well as any potential appeals  
18 regarding this matter, may remain focused on substance rather than on semantic gamesmanship.

19 Defendant Naphcare does not oppose the filing of the amended complaint as long as the  
20 clarifying language proposed in the Fourth Amended Complaint does not cure the fatal deficiencies  
21 laid out in defendant's Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 39).

22 Plaintiff replies that the filing of the Fourth Amended Complaint would not have, and  
23 should not be construed to have, any effect on Naphcare's pending Motion to Dismiss  
24 (ECF No. 39), plaintiffs' Opposition (ECF No. 47), and/or Naphcare's Reply (ECF No. 49).

25 The district judge will determine what, if any, significance the Fourth Amended Complaint  
26 has on any motions pending before her. The court will grant the parties motion to amend the  
27 complaint, and will extend the discovery and related deadlines 90 days from the existing deadlines.  
28 Accordingly,

